

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by St. Louis University. Subscription price: \$1.00 a Year.
Entered as second-class matter at St. Louis, Mo., Post-Office.

Vol. XVIII

NOVEMBER, 1941

No. 2

Commentarii De Commentariis Caesaris

BY NORMAN J. DEWITT
Washington University

Caesar is no longer the principal victim of the beginning student's first assault upon Latin prose. The trend is now in the direction of more appealing fare. Yet the tradition that Caesar should provide what T. Rice Holmes called a 'whetstone for gerund-grinders' is so strong that we sometimes forget the comparative novelty of the *Commentaries* as an elementary text. Only in the last of their twenty centuries of existence have they been read by beginners. Previously Caesar was read by experts and connoisseurs of various sorts, but seldom by adolescents.

Our earliest reference to the *Commentaries* regards them as a literary achievement. Cicero, in his *Brutus* (262), suggested that their merit was such as to discourage all but the undiscerning imitator in time to come. Several years later Hirtius, in his apologetic introduction to the final book on the Gallic wars, spoke of Caesar's *facultas atque elegantia summa scribendi*. But the *Commentaries* do not appear to have been popular. During the later period of antiquity and in the middle ages they were neither widely known or read. No copies of the *Corpus Caesarianum* are listed in medieval library catalogues before the 11th century. In the early English chronicles references to Caesar are third or fourth-hand and badly garbled. Caesar himself was a semi-legendary figure regarded vaguely by the learned as the first Roman emperor, and suspected in some quarters of having trafficked with the powers of darkness. Hence, perhaps, the belief that he was the inventor of the ablative case. As the humanistic revival gained strength, the rapid dispersal of classical manuscripts made possible a more accurate knowledge of Caesar. Proper definition of his stature—to which Petrarch made signal contribution—enhanced the value of his writings. The demand for texts of Caesar may be inferred from the number of printed editions that followed the *editio princeps* issued at Rome in 1469—eight before 1490.

Caesar provided a handbook of the military art for tacticians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. New implements and techniques of war stimulated the study of military theory. There were many would-be Caesars. One of Montaigne's essays refers to Marshal Strozzi, the Florentine leader, who attempted (without success) to make Caesar his model. "Certainly a most excellent choice," wrote Montaigne, "for, in truth, he ought to be the breviary of every military man, as being the true and sovereign patron of the art of war."

The new nations in Europe found gratifying references to their past in Caesar. The following title published in London in 1530 shows how the *Commentaries*

appealed to national pride: *Iulius Cæsars commentaries. Newly translatyd owte of laten in to englyshe as much as concernyth thys realme of England sumtyme callyd Brytayne: which is the eldyt hystoryer of all that can be found that ever wrote of thys realme of England.*

National interest was paralleled by local or antiquarian interest. One by-product of such interest was the romantic conception of the Druids which was built up during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Local researches were naturally frequent in France. Identification of a site mentioned by Caesar with the home town appealed to local pride and to the Gallic aptitude for impassioned controversy. Many pamphlets were written and much hard feeling expressed before it was established that Alesia was on Mt. Auxois in Burgundy and not at Alaise in Franche-Comté. Military, national, and local interest were combined in Napoleon III's studies of Caesar.

Neither national nor antiquarian interest exercised any influence in America. Captain Miles Standish possessed a copy of Caesar, perhaps because he was a soldier. Use of the *Commentaries* as a school text began only after the Revolution. In 1785 Columbia announced that "no candidate shall be admitted to the college after the second Tuesday in April, 1786, unless he shall be able to render into English Caesar's *Commentaries of the Gallic War*." The first American edition of Caesar came out in 1802. By the middle of the century Caesar had joined Cicero and Vergil to form the inescapable triumvirate—the *Parci*, as it were—of secondary school study.

The reading of Caesar by beginners appears to have originated in the German *Gymnasium* system. The new humanistic curriculum out of which the *gymnasium* evolved was established at Strasbourg in 1538 by Johannes Sturm (1507-1589). But it was long before Caesar became the first and most difficult hazard in the course of Latin instruction. His earlier readers generally met him on the third-year level. Just why he was brought to the attention of beginners is difficult to determine. Perhaps it was because his style showed a strict regard for the norm of strict Roman usage, making possible the formulation of rules to which there were no exceptions such as one finds in other authors. Moreover, the study of grammar was becoming more important, and syntax followed fast. Certainly the intense syntactical dissection of Latin which reached its height in this country about 1900 was reflected in secondary school texts. Caesar was suitable, too, because he expressed no abstract ideas and because his works contained no incidents or expressions that were better not brought to the attention of tender minds.

The general feeling now appears to be that Caesar should either be denatured or dropped. And, in the dialectic of the New Education, the *Commentaries* do

not seem to produce social values functionally related to a curriculum designed to prepare students for citizenship in a changing world—whatever that means. To be sure, it is difficult to argue for the prescription of Caesar in the case of the student who will receive only a moderate dose of Latin in high school—the student who will not go on to college, or, if he does, will say that he ‘had’ Latin, much as he might speak of the mumps.

Yet, apart from the practical value of the *Commentaries* to those who are chiefly interested in peddling principal parts, there is much to be said for Caesar. His claim to a place somewhere in the course of study is incontestable. The literary value of the *Commentaries* will be obvious in any survey of Roman literature, particularly from the standpoint of the development of Latin prose. Caesar’s Latin, together with Cicero’s, represents the end result of a century of conscious effort on the part of those who spoke the language of the senate. The prose of both men served as a practical illustration of opposing theories of composition; both were the product of an art without being artificial.

Caesar’s claim to attention as an historian is perhaps less apparent although equally compelling. Mommsen’s suggestion that the *Commentaries* were conscious propaganda intended to justify to the Roman reader Caesar’s procedure in Gaul has found general acceptance; this may be true to some extent, but the title of the work, and Cicero’s remarks in which he is obviously praising the *Commentaries* for what they were supposed to be, strengthens the belief that Caesar intended them to be a source for historians in the future.

From the standpoint of Roman history, Caesar’s *Commentaries* are interesting because Caesar wrote them, and important because they document the fact that Gaul became a Roman province. But the student of Roman history who reads them will know little more about Roman history than he did before he started. On the other hand, if the student is alert, he will know a great deal about Gaul. That is to say, the *Commentaries* are our best literary document for the study of Gaul.

The history of Gaul may appear to be interesting to the antiquarian rather than important to the historian. But in view of the present tendency to view the continuity of history rather than to present it in disjointed segments of nationalistic studies, the history of Gaul assumes considerable importance. The Gauls, or Celts, were one of the most powerful peoples of ancient times; their influence upon the course of history, however, is less apparent because it was indirect. The nature of this influence is implied in the title of Carcopino’s monograph on Gallo-Roman relations, *L’impérialisme renversé*—“Imperialism in Reverse”. Similarly, Roman Gaul is best understood as a fusion of two cultural traditions: that of Graeco-Roman civilization which had developed in the Mediterranean area, and that of the Gauls which was native to continental western Europe. The history of Gallic civilization did not end in 52 B.C. It should be regarded as a continuity in which Caesar’s conquest of Gaul was only an episode. Out of Gaul came Roman Gaul and out of Roman Gaul came France.

There is at present no single study which provides the necessary background for a comprehensive study of Caesar. T. Rice Holmes’ *Caesar’s Conquest of Gaul*

(1911) is indispensable so far as it goes. It contains a vast amount of reliable information which, unfortunately, is not organized according to any comprehensive point of view. Since 1911 a great deal of new material has appeared which is not accessible to the ordinary student. This material needs to be organized and synthesized. If a study of this sort were available, it would make possible an up-to-date appraisal of Caesar in an attractive form, and relate a valuable Latin author to the more comprehensive point of view which is now becoming necessary in studies of the past. In more simple terms, it may be said that the student who is thus enabled to read between the lines in the *Commentaries* will be agreeably surprised to find evidence of a lively and enterprising people whose social, economic, and political system was by no means primitive and whose civilization, even if it was overshadowed by the richer culture of the Mediterranean area, made a substantial contribution to the history of human experience.

Electioneering 2000 Years Ago (II)

By SISTER AGNES DE SALES MOLYNEUX, S.C.

Catholic Teachers College of New Mexico, Albuquerque

“So much for your friends,” Quintus continues. “Your enemies comprise (1) those whom you have injured; (2) those who hate you without cause; (3) those who are staunch allies of your rivals. With regard to the first, explain to them the obligations which constrained you to speak against them in behalf of a friend; justify yourself completely, and lead them to see that if they transfer their friendship to you, you will show equal zeal for their interests in the future. As for those who dislike you without cause, change their unreasonable attitude by a show of interest in their affairs, and by a pledge of future benefits. Use the same tactics with the third class, and if you can bring yourself to it, show good will even toward your rivals themselves.”

The second indispensable condition for success is the formation of public opinion in the candidate’s favor. “This demands a suave manner, the ability to call persons by name, being always in evidence, lavish generosity, good publicity, confidence in your statesmanship. Step up your habit of greeting people by name. There is nothing else that so surely wins the average man. You are not lacking in the affability which becomes a polished gentleman, but what is needed now is flattery, which, though vicious and shameful under ordinary circumstances, during a political campaign is indispensable.” Then he adds this gem: “When flattery makes someone worse, it is wrong; when it makes him more friendly, it is not so wrong; but for a candidate it is obligatory. His facial expression and his utterances must change to harmonize with the sentiment of each one he meets. Make a display of liberality. This usually takes the form of banquets at which you and your friends must be present. Also sponsor public works, especially such as benefit the largest number, and the populace will be vastly impressed. Be accessible day and night, invariably the good fellow, so that all will be convinced that what you promise you will fulfill wholeheartedly.”

The next passage is still dubious. The best available MSS. read *aut iucunde neget*, with no alternative clause. *Aut omnino non neget* has been suggested. It suits the sense of what follows. The passage so reconstructed reads: "When you are asked the impossible, either refuse pleasantly or do not refuse at all, ever. The first is the conduct of a good man, the second that of a good canvasser," he acknowledges honestly. "However," he adds, "Cotta, who was an artist in canvassing, never refused, relying on the possibility that the occasion of fulfilling the promise would never occur, or that when the occasion did arise, he would then find it possible to do what now seemed impossible. Besides, should you promise what you cannot fulfill, the indignation of the disappointed supporter is far in the future and may be placated, whereas if you refuse, his enmity is certain and immediate. In short, keep wide open house, let your callers depart staunch friends eager to spread the best reports of you."

Good publicity is, of course, of prime importance. "It must broadcast the confidence business men have in you; the approval of the aristocracy; the admiration of the young men who frequent your company; the affection of the clients you have successfully defended; the multitude of Italians who crowd into Rome to support your campaign; the invaluable services you have rendered to many citizens — all these things must come to be the daily topic of conversation, wherever men foregather."

"The common people of Rome," he reminds Marcus, "and the politicians who control their vote, were all yours at one time, because you successfully supported Pompey, because you accepted the case for Manilius, because you defended Cornelius." "Now," continues Quintus, "you must regain this enthusiastic support of the masses, which no one up until now has ever had, who at the same time enjoyed, as you do, the good opinion of the classes. Make sure, too, that the plebs know you have the wholehearted support of Pompey—in fact, that your election will fit in exactly with his plans." (You will recall that he had previously warned Marcus that his friendship with Pompey was a hindrance to his election as far as the senatorial party was concerned.)

"Finally," he goes on, "let your entire campaign be honorable, brilliant, enthusiastic, popular yet dignified, so that, if such a thing were possible, another blot may be shown up, by way of contrast, in that of your opponents—a disgrace in keeping with their reputation for crime, lust, and bribery."

"Inspire every class with confidence that you will promote the general welfare, but, during the campaign, avoid above all things, committing yourself to any definite policy. Be vague and general, and as a result, the senate, judging the usual trend of your political sympathies, will believe that you will uphold its authority" (*senatus auctoritas, ordinum concordia* were the stock phrases of Cicero); "the knights and the wealthy, conservative party will be confident that you will maintain peace at any cost; and the masses, because you have favored them in many a legal trial, and in your public speeches have expressed solicitude for their

interests, will feel sure of your protection in the future.

"Last of all remember: THIS IS ROME—Rome, the melting pot of nations, *civitas ex nationum conventu constituta*, in which thrive many plots, many rackets, vice in all its varieties; in which, only the utmost prudence can keep one clear of scandal.

"Wherefore, I urge you again and again—live up to the lofty ideals you have set yourself. Maintain the high standard of your speeches. For it is by oratory that Romans are attracted, retained, prevented from impeding wise policies and from adopting harmful ones. And since it is through bribery especially that the state has come to the pass in which it is, show that you are the one person who can strike the maximum fear of prosecution and certain conviction into the minds of your opponents. Let them know they are being closely watched by you—that they have to take into account not only your vigilance, not only your power as an orator, but the enthusiastic backing of the entire equestrian order. Take adequate measures also to intimidate the contact and the pay-off men (*sequestres et divisoires*) and there will be no bribery, or at least not enough to achieve the desired result.

"These are the points which (though I do not know them any better than you) I thought I could more easily collect, occupied as you are at the present." Then he adds by way of postscript, betraying his secret hope for the perpetuity of his writing: "Although this is written, not for political candidates in general, but for you personally in this particular campaign, still if you think that something should be changed, omitted, or added, I wish you would tell me, for I would like this handbook of electioneering (*commentariolum petitionis*) to be regarded as perfect in every detail." If Marcus complied with this request, he did not, at any rate, leave on his brother's work any imprint of his own style. The only other writings of Quintus we have with which to compare the electioneering pamphlet are four brief, occasional letters. Naturally the style of these differs somewhat from that of the more formal *commentariolum petitionis*, yet there are peculiarities of expression pointing to a common authorship—notably a fondness for the phrases, *cura ut, fac ut, cogita ut*, as well as for new words of Quintus' own coinage.

This is merely in passing, for my purpose has been only to cite from the letter salient passages, either of historical significance, or of psychological interest, as illustrating the fact that though the externals of human life have been changed—language, dress, even the professed theory of God,—the inner man remains surprisingly and discouragingly the same.

The World—Ever-changing, Yet Ever the Same

Omnia mortali mutantur lege creata;
Nec se cognoscunt terrae, vertentibus annis;
Exutae variant faciem per saecula gentes.
At manet incolumis mundus, suaeque omnia servat,
Quae nec longa dies auget, minuitve senectus:
Idem semper erit, quoniam semper fuit idem, . . .
Non casus opus est, magni sed numinis ordo.

Manilius, *Astron.* I, 504-9; 519.

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August and September by
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription price: \$1.00 a year

Entered as second-class matter, at the post-office at St. Louis,
Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S.J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S.J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.
A. A. Jacobsmeyer, S.J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.
Joseph A. Walsh, S.J. John Carroll University, Cleveland, O.
F. A. Sullivan, S.J. St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Francis X. Entz, S.J. St. Charles College, Grand Coteau, La.
James E. Malone, S.J. Santa Clara U., Santa Clara, Cal.
Carol L. Bernhardt, S.J. Weston College, Weston, Mass.

BUSINESS EDITOR

Joseph F. Jelinek, S.J. St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Vol. XVIII

NOVEMBER, 1941

No. 2

Editorial

Last year, our readers may recall, the Greek Academy, the Classical Club, and the French Club, of the College of Liberal Arts of Fordham University, combined to stage a trilogy in three languages: the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, the *Aulularia* of Plautus, and *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* of Molière. In May this year the same College rendered *Oedipus Tyrannus* in Greek before some 3400 persons interested in the classics. The music for this play was written by Virgil Thomson, musical critic of The New York Herald Tribune. Many laudatory comments, we hear, were received at Fordham upon the finish and impressiveness of the performance. Ground is already being broken, so we learn, for a large-scale production of either the *Agamemnon* or the *Eumenides* next year.

The Greek particles were still dancing about the Fordham University Campus when, a few days later, *Oedipus the King*, presented in modern dramatic verse with choruses in rhyme, thrilled some six hundred friends of the classics, chiefly members of literary and dramatic clubs, at Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama. It was evidently the crowning event in the life of the school: the translation, the costumes, the choreography, the lighting, the programs, and the music for the choruses composed in Dorian, Lydian, Phrygian, and Hypolydian modes—all were the work of the students.

This is good news for all those that love things classical and believe in the permanent relevancy of classical antiquity. We can hardly think of a more telling way of bringing what is best in ancient civilization before the eyes and ears of a modern audience. Presented with sympathy, the old masterpieces will even today throb with the life and significance they possessed at their original staging in the distant past. In a true sense, their significance may be even greater today when we are able to view them through the accumulated experience and wisdom of the intervening centuries, and judge them by the principles of Christian humanism.

We sincerely hope the example set by Fordham and Spring Hill¹ will encourage other institutions throughout the land to contribute their share to the revival of the classics. *Si alii, cur non ego?*

¹ *The Classical Outlook* for October tells of similar recent exhibitions: Randolph-Macon Woman's College presented Euripides' *Bacchae* in Greek; Aristophanes' *Peace*, in abridged form, was given in Greek on the Swarthmore College campus; Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pa., presented, as its seventeenth consecutive performance of a Greek play in English, Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*.

A Natural Evangel

Fordham University has always remembered the not-too-hidden bond between the classics and Christianity. Tonight she restores a play that is a natural evangel of the value and dignity of the individual. Sophocles has thrust aside every large sociological and political question to focus attention upon the mysterious beauty of the pain of man—for whom the world is too much because he is too great for the world's joy. The capacity for pain is not altogether disaster. Through its infinity there is the sudden revelation of a depth that is deeper and larger than all matter. There is no dogma more important than this depth and none more requiring restoration today.—From the program announcing the Fordham University presentation of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, May 9, 1941.

Latin in English¹

BY GRACE LIGHT

Grover Cleveland High School, New York City

Our English language is about seven hundred years old. The Thorndyke-Grinstead Word-Count shows that over 52 per cent of our words come from Latin and 10 per cent from Greek. To the serious student of English some acquaintance with Latin is not merely valuable but quite literally indispensable. Every great English writer from the time of King Alfred to the time of Alfred Tennyson has, almost without exception, been schooled in the Latin language and has written under the influence of the Latin models.

However, it is often urged that the meaning of English words of Latin derivation has so changed that it may be better learned directly from English usage. But this is the easy method for the corruption of speech. This is why we find students saying 'stupendous' for 'im-mense,' 'amazing' for 'remarkable,' 'supine' for 'prone,' 'ardent' for 'energetic.'

A student's power over the English dictionary, his acquaintance with the commonplaces of classical allusion, his ability to read a page of Shakespeare, varies directly with the number of years in which he has studied Latin. For a test on vocabulary try some of these words: 'latent, temporizing, concomitant, decorum, mitigate, plenipotentiary, taciturn' (not harder than a list employed for testing jurymen in Chicago some time ago).

Latin and Greek acquaint us with countless allusions to classical mythology in English literature. Thus in poetry:

Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hands?—Shakespeare, *Macbeth*

A little Cyclops with one eye

Staring to threaten and defy.—Wordsworth, *To a Daisy*

In prose we find: "This is a Janus-faced fact" (*Atlantic Monthly*). "The publication of this book exposed the Achilles' heel of the South" (Simons,

Social Forces of American History). Need we add "the Trojan Horse"?

The rapid developments of science and technology have necessitated the invention of new technical and semi-technical terms, and most of these are borrowed from Latin or Greek sources. Some words of fairly recent coinage are: 'dictaphone, submarine, television, microphone, mimeograph, binocular, vitamin, dirigible.'

In biology, physiology, zoology, Latin and Greek are the keys to the meaning of the terms. Did you know that there are more than two hundred bones in your body each of which has a Greek or Latin name? That in science you are known as *homo sapiens*? That without the *orbicularis oculi* you could not go to sleep to-night?

The scientific names of all animals are Latin or Greek, as 'dog' (*canis*), 'lion' (*leo*), 'goat' (*capra*). Botanical terms, the names of many of our common flowers, the names of botanical processes—such as 'germination, pollination, transpiration'—are largely of classical origin.

The scientific or Latin designation of a drug is the same the world over, while the common name may vary, even in different sections of the same country. The medical student, well prepared in Greek and Latin, has an advantage over one who has not studied these languages. A knowledge of medical abbreviations taken from Latin is invaluable to a nurse. How many of these do you know?

R. (recipe) 'take';
Q.i.d. (quater in die) 'four times a day';
H.s. (hora somni) 'at sleeping time';
A.c. (ante cibum) 'before meals';
P.c. (post cibum) 'after meals'.

Thus for English and for natural sciences the study of Latin is of primary importance.

¹ [A Radio Broadcast, Station WNYC, May 9, 1941. The same Station carried, on the same occasion, Dr. Ch. A. Tonsor's talk, "A Case for the Classics," printed in *THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN* for October. Mr. Arthur H. Reheuser's talk, given at the same time, will be published later. All three speakers are teachers at Grover Cleveland High School, New York City. *Ed. Note*]

"Studies and Documents"

It is a pleasure to call attention to "Studies and Documents," a scholarly undertaking under the general editorship of Professor Kirsopp Lake and Dr. Silva Lake, which is concerned with texts of fundamental importance for the history of Early Christianity. A full description of the 13 volumes thus far published may be obtained from The University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

- I. *Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*, by R. P. Casey, Brown U. \$4.50.
- II. *Epiphanius de Gemmis*, by P. Blake, Harvard U., and Abbé Henri de Vis, Brussels. \$10.00.
- III. *The Dura Fragment of the Diatessaron of Tatian*, by Carl H. Kraeling, Yale U. \$2.00.
- IV. *Visio Sancti Pauli*, by Theodore Silverstein, U. of Kansas City. \$5.00.
- V. *Family II and Codex Alexandrinus*, by Silva Lake. \$4.25.
- VI. *Excavations and Protosinaitic Inscriptions at Serabit el Khadem*, by R. F. S. Starr, Princeton U., and R. F. Butin, Cath. U. \$3.75.
- VII. *De Jona*, by Hans Levy, Hebrew U. in Jerusalem. \$2.00.
- VIII. *The Book of Enoch*, by Campbell Bonner, U. of Michigan. \$4.00.

- IX. *Ritual and Cults of pre-Roman Iguvium*, by Irene Rosenzweig. \$4.25.
- X. *Kalilah and Dimna*, by Elinor Husselman, U. of Michigan. \$2.00.
- XI. *The Text of the Ferrar Group (Fam. 13) in Mark*, by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake. \$4.25.
- XII. *The Homily on the Passion by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, and Fragments of the Apocryphal of Ezekiel*, by Campbell Bonner, U. of Michigan. \$5.00.
- XIII. *An Archaeological Record of Rome*, by Inez Ryberg, Vassar College. \$6.00.

The 13 volumes have also been grouped in four series, each obtainable at \$12.00.

Ordinarily, the *CLASSICAL BULLETIN* is being mailed to our subscribers on or about the twentieth of the preceding month. If for one reason or another it does not reach them before the end of the month, will they please let us know without delay.

Stock Taking

By ROBERT V. CRAM
University of Minnesota

The teacher, as well as the shopkeeper, should take inventory from time to time. I would ask the reader of this article to consider thoughtfully one question: in the course of his experience as student and instructor, has the teaching of Latin shown an improvement? If, with the writer, he would answer in the negative, it should be worth while to examine the reasons for this situation, and to attempt to put forward some plan, some suggestions at least, for its betterment.

This discussion has a twofold postulate; that the fundamental purpose of education is to train the student to think straight and to use the English language correctly and with perspicuity, and, secondly, that the study of Latin, when properly taught, is of especial value for the attainment of this end.

As I look back over my own experience, covering more than a quarter of a century, it is my considered opinion that the teaching of Latin has become increasingly unsatisfactory, not only in the secondary school, but even at the college level. In the university with which I am most familiar, many a student who has had two, three, even four years of Latin in high school shows so little knowledge of elementary forms and syntax that it is necessary to provide a systematic review before he is fitted to continue. Students who have transferred from other colleges and now wish to enter courses specially designed for the training of teachers often give evidence of this same weakness. In fact, some who have technically completed their undergraduate major and desire to start work toward a graduate degree are seriously hampered by their inadequate preparation in Latin and in the fundamentals of English grammar.

Last fall, a student of better than average intelligence who had had two years of Latin in the high school of a well-known small city was taking an elementary course in Vergil. At the end of the second week, when asked to explain a certain type of ablative, this student replied that she had never heard the word 'ablative' used; subsequent painful experience substantiated the truth of this remarkable statement.

In my experience, it has been rarely the case that a student, even in a graduate course, has known the

literal translation of the gerundive, while all too few have been familiar with the syntax of the subjunctive.

There are two fundamental reasons for bad teaching where it actually does exist. The first of these is the inadequate foundation in Latin of the teacher himself. At least twice, during past summers, young women have come to me with the statement that they had promised to teach first and second year Latin in the fall, but had had no Latin whatsoever themselves. So what ought they to do? One young teacher set forth the situation frankly; she said, "I am a science teacher. I have been teaching this subject for four years in a consolidated high school. This spring, my principal said that I must teach two years of Latin in the fall. When I told him that this was impossible, because I had never studied it myself, he replied that either I would teach Latin or else he would find a teacher that could, and reduce my salary accordingly. I did not propose to have my salary cut, so I told him that I would teach Latin."

Last summer, a language teacher from a suburban Eastern school of a city whose name is a name to conjure with, consulted me. Her principal insisted that she teach first and second year Latin during the following school year; when she told him that she had had only two years of Latin herself, and that ten years ago, he calmly assured her that she could manage it all right,—and she consented.

Six months ago, I was consulted by a mother whose daughter, a student in a large city high school, was in great need of tutoring in Latin. According to the mother, the child was an excellent student, but could learn absolutely nothing from her Latin teacher. When I asked the name of the teacher, it proved to be one who had failed in the teachers' course in Latin in college.

In one of the other city high schools, the Latin instructor's foundation consisted of nine months of elementary Latin taken in college fifteen years ago. As a contrast, in the same city, an exceptionally brilliant student, one who majored in the classics and took an M.A. in that field, has never been given an opportunity to teach Latin, but instead has been teaching English for several years.

Unquestionably, there are many excellent Latin teachers, both in the city schools and in the rural districts, but there are far too many whose qualifications parallel the cases cited. Were this situation confined to the secondary schools, it would be sufficiently distressing. Unfortunately, it is not.

I would like to raise a number of questions, but leave the answers to the good sense of my readers. What possible value has the study of Latin if it is taught by an incompetent teacher? What is the minimum amount of Latin that a teacher may possess and at the same time adequately fulfil his duty as a teacher? Is the situation, as described above, fair to the student who majors in Latin in a College of Education or who takes a graduate degree with this as his major field? Above all, is it fair to the unfortunate adolescent who chances to fall into the clutches of such a teacher?

When I mentioned this problem recently to a well-known educator, he replied that of course all this was very wrong, but that, in his opinion, the situation was

no worse now than it had been when he and I went to school. He may be right, though I cannot agree with him,—but that is not the point. The point is this: is such a condition to persist; can nothing be done to remedy matters? I am not unaware of the social and financial problems with which the school superintendent has to contend, especially in the rural districts, but I would insist that it would be better to offer no Latin at all than to entrust the teaching of it to an ill-prepared and incompetent teacher.

The second fundamental cause for the inadequate preparation of students is the manner in which Latin is taught by many who are competent to teach it. It would seem axiomatic that the ordinary forms and constructions of any language must be thoroughly mastered before the student can hope to read the literature of that tongue with profit and enjoyment. Certainly, the first two years, at least, should be used to emphasize the establishment of this absolutely essential groundwork. In a course in Vergil, grammatical questions should be avoided as far as possible, while in more advanced work, only unusual constructions or those of exceptional interest need be discussed.

Because it is such a highly inflected language, Latin is a difficult subject; this should be explained to students at the outset. The ordinary forms and constructions must be learned once and for all. I have never been able to understand how time can be found for games and all the other devices intended to make Latin more palatable. No matter how clever the teacher, the fact must remain that Latin cannot be mastered without real study.

Much, however, of a legitimate nature can be done to make this study interesting and profitable. The nature of the inflection of nouns and verbs can be—and should be—explained simply; in my own experience, students generally find such explanations interesting. Certainly, the relationship between Latin and English should be constantly emphasized; what better way is there to teach the third declension and the irregular comparatives than to show the English derivatives taken from these bases?

I am convinced that if a student has once learned the literal translation of the gerundive, he will never experience any difficulty with that bugbear, the passive periphrastic conjugation. After teaching the student that *amandus* means 'to be loved'; *monendus*, 'to be advised'; etc., have him learn such common gerundives, borrowed into English, as 'memorandum,' 'a thing to be remembered'; the plural 'memoranda,' 'things to be remembered'; 'propaganda,' 'things to be spread about'; 'agenda,' 'things to be done,' or, more freely, 'the program of a meeting'; 'dividend,' 'a thing to be divided,' etc.

To make one more suggestion for reading—why do teachers of *Caesar* so seldom read chapters eleven to twenty-eight of Book VI, which describe the customs of the early French and Germans, and why do they neglect the description of Britain and its products in Book V? Apart from their intrinsic interest, these passages are of decided importance for the student of history.

The subject that has been discussed in this paper is

not a new one. On the contrary, the situation had become so bad in the twenties that we had a 'classical investigation,' the results of which were published in 1927. In that investigation, the points emphasized were these: we should read as much as possible, and we should make Latin itself as palatable as possible. For my part, I am utterly opposed to either expedient if it is to be done at the expense of learning, and learning thoroughly, the essentials.

The study of Latin has been on the decline in our schools for a considerable time. In my opinion, the suggestions which have resulted from the 'classical investigation' have not arrested the process, but have, on the contrary, positively conduced to bad teaching. Education in general has been suffering increasingly from too many experiments. Since the turn of the century this has been the case, and we have no reason to assume that a change is in sight.

It may be objected that a very large proportion of high school graduates never go to college, and that of those that do go, only a small number continue the study of Latin. And yet, the proper teaching of Latin does provide valuable training, a training to be had through no other study, save perhaps that of mathematics. As a discipline which will enable the student to understand and use the English language, there can be no question but that it is of incalculable value. I have already suggested that the absolute essentials of Latin can be learned in two years, if the subject is rightly taught, and even this relatively small amount will have a real and a constructive influence upon the student, provided that he is mentally equipped to undertake the study of any language. But, if Latin is not to be *properly* taught, then of what value can it be to any school curriculum?

The Aftermath of the Catilinarian Conspiracy¹

By W. E. GWATKIN, JR.
The University of Missouri

Now that it is past history, it can be seen that the Catilinarian conspiracy was not as important as Cicero would have had his fellow citizens believe. But at the time this was by no means so clear. The defeat of Catiline's military forces was not inevitable, especially when it appeared that slaves might be armed. Neither was it certain how many conspirators were left inside the city, nor how many in high places viewed the movement with favor. Even after the execution of Lentulus and the rest in the Tullianum on the fifth of December, and the defeat and death of Catiline one month later, uncertainty prevailed, and even before it became apparent that the conspiracy was dead there were repercussions.

Who was behind Catiline? Nobody knows exactly. Crassus and Caesar came under suspicion at once.² The day after Cicero's *Third Oration* an informer named Lucius Tarquinius tried to implicate Crassus before the Senate, but was declared a liar by that body. Two prominent senators urged Cicero to charge Caesar with complicity, and other efforts were directed against him later. There are many opinions possible, but I believe it safest to hold that there is no evidence that either Crassus or Caesar instigated Catiline, but that each

probably was ready to take hold of the movement in case it developed to the point of usability. Though it has been overlooked, the third member of the future First Triumvirate, Pompey, was in somewhat the same position, although at a second remove. Crassus and Caesar were both in Rome, and Pompey was in Asia. But he had an agent in Rome in the person of Metellus Nepos, who had been sent back to the city, had run for the office of tribune, and had been elected. Since the tribunes went into office on the tenth of December there was therefore an overlap of about three weeks when Cicero was still consul and Metellus Nepos tribune. The latter soon began to exploit an anti-Ciceronian feeling pervading a portion of the Roman citizen body, and to make political capital of that still undecided constitutional question as to whether a *senatus consultum ultimum* justified the execution of Roman citizens without the appeal to the whole people guaranteed by law. Earlier in the same year this had been brought to the front by Caesar and Labienus when they prosecuted Rabirius, whose only possible defense for participation in the mob which killed Saturninus thirty-seven years previously would have been that it was justified under such a decree. Now on the last day of December Metellus Nepos forbade Cicero to address the people because he had denied Roman citizens the right of appeal. Cicero made the best of the situation by adding to the customary oath the declaration, "This city and commonwealth has been preserved from destruction by me," and he was gratified by the public response.³ But he must have realized that there was a considerable feeling against him.

There ensued a bitter controversy between the two men. Reticence was not Cicero's strong point, and he let himself go. He assailed the tribune in the Senate on the first of January, 62 B.C. Metellus Nepos came back at him before the entire people on the third, and the ex-consul answered in an oration of which a few scattered fragments are left. Soon afterwards Metellus Nepos' brother, Metellus Celer, wrote the orator a letter of protest, which we may read in Cicero's *Letters*, along with the skillful reply.⁴ Metellus Celer's wife was the famous Clodia, who was therefore Metellus Nepos' sister-in-law, and Cicero seemingly had tried to induce her, as well as Pompey's wife, to appease the angry tribune, but to no avail.

This squabble with Metellus has, I think, left its influence upon the *Catilinarian Orations* themselves. What we have is not a stenographic report of Cicero's actual words, but the version afterwards given to the public. Sallust says as much concerning the *First Oration*: *orationem . . . quam postea scriptam edidit*.⁵ Cicero in a letter to Atticus indicates that the collected speeches of his consulship were not published till after June 1, 60 B.C.⁶ But it is almost certain that the *Catilinarians* individually or as a group were struck off closer to the event, while the Catilinarian conspiracy was still a live issue. My opinion is that they came out very shortly after Cicero laid down his consulship—that is, in those days when he was engaged in acrimonious debate with Metellus Nepos.

In the *Catilinarians* Cicero speaks much of *invidia*, his word for what I have called anti-Ciceronian senti-

ment. His general attitude is that though sure to receive it, he is willing to endure it for a consciousness of duty well done. *Hoc animo fui semper ut invidiam virtute partam gloriam, non invidiam putarem*, he cries.⁷ There was no doubt some of this in the orations as delivered, but I suspect that a considerable amount of the argument along this line was introduced into the text when he revised his speeches for publication. He has done his work so well that I think it futile to try to separate the additions from the words actually delivered. But he is doing more than answer the future. When he published his speeches he knew that there was *invidia* abroad, for the bitter words of Metellus Nepos had forced it upon his attention.

The conservatives had taken fright at the candidacy of Metellus Nepos, and had succeeded in electing Cato as another of the tribunes. The two locked horns soon, when Metellus proposed to recall Pompey from the East, either to suppress Catiline or to restore order in general. Here Cato blocked the way. He fought the proposal in the Senate and before the people, where Metellus had the backing of Caesar, now praetor. Cato forbade even the reading of the bill. Metellus started to read it anyhow. Cato grabbed it away, and when Metellus began to recite it from memory another tribune clapped his hand over his mouth. This was too much, and the armed followers of both Cato and Metellus began to fight it out. The net result was that Metellus didn't get his bill read, and that later in the day the Senate passed a decree suspending both Metellus and Caesar from office. Metellus, after some rather lurid oratory, left the city and went back to Pompey in Asia. Caesar kept his head, waited for the storm to blow over, and was reinstated in his office the next day.⁸

By this time Catiline had been defeated and killed on the field of Pistoria. Now came the time for punishing the remaining conspirators in Rome. Our scant information concerning this comes from hints in one oration of Cicero.⁹ Lucius Vargunteius was now deserted by Hortensius, his defender in a former trial; Autronius appealed to Cicero for aid, but Cicero testified against him. Servius Sulla and Publius Sulla were prosecuted; so also were Laeca, at whose house the famous meeting of the conspirators had been held, and Gaius Cornelius, one of the two *equites* who had promised to murder Cicero in his bed. The charge against all seems to have been that of *vis*, under the *lex Plautia*, the same enactment under which Catiline himself had been indicted before Cicero drove him from the city. From the tone of Cicero's language it seems certain that all were found guilty, but we have no evidence as to their punishment, save the knowledge that four years later one of them was living in exile in Epirus.

Another person prosecuted was Publius Cornelius Sulla, and we have the speech which Cicero delivered in his defense, the *Pro Sulla*. Sulla had been one of the consuls-elect removed for bribery just before the so-called First Conspiracy. The charge that he had been involved in this earlier activity of Catiline had been handled by one of the associated counsel, Quintus Hortensius, and Cicero addressed himself to the charge of complicity in the second conspiracy. His oration is aptly characterized by an editor as 'a thoroughly artistic handling of

a somewhat ordinary theme.' Only two points, I think, are worthy of notice: first, that Cicero's only real argument is that he, as consul, had never heard a word to connect Sulla with the conspiracy, and second, that Cicero is at pains to point out that he is merciful and temperate in nature, as well as capable of the ferocity and tenacity of purpose evinced in the *Catilinarians*.

But these were the small fry of the conspiracy. What of the higher-ups, if there had been higher-ups? Somebody—we don't know who—tried to drag Caesar's name in, but seemingly couldn't find credible evidence. One rather common informer, Vettius, promised to produce a letter to Catiline written by Caesar, but never did bring it forth; and Caesar, who was praetor, thereupon clapped him in jail. We hear again of Curius, through whom and whose mistress Fulvia Cicero had got much of his information in 63. Curius turned up in the Senate to testify that Catiline had said that Caesar had been in the plot. Caesar's defense was quick; he simply asked Cicero whether he hadn't given the consul information concerning the conspirators.¹⁰

So Catiline's machinations seemed past history by the end of 62 B.C. There were, however, two remainders—one, Cicero's own conviction that his suppression of the conspiracy was the greatest event in all history, and the second, a latent antipathy to high-handed methods used in the execution of the conspirators. The conflict of these factors conditions Cicero's personal history for the next four years. Without further aggravation they might have passed away without great results. But the entrance of other factors decreed otherwise—the bitter personal antipathies of Clodius and Cicero, the latter's refusal to co-operate with the members of the First Triumvirate, and their consequent failure to restrain Clodius. I omit the rather familiar outline of events simply to point out that the nominal reason for Cicero's exile was his execution of the Catilinarian conspirators. Clodius' first bill versus Cicero read: *qui civem Romanum indemnatum interemisisset, ei aqua et igni interdiceretur*.¹¹

Most of the long story of Cicero's efforts to defend himself against Clodius is known to us from the *Letters*. But one document in point is an oration delivered just before his exile in defense of Lucius Flaccus, that Flaccus who was one of the praetors who arrested the Allobroges at the Mulvian Bridge. The charge against Flaccus concerned misgovernment in Asia, but in one of his asides the orator breaks out in defense of all who had in any way suppressed the Catilinarians, and especially in defense of himself: "No one who hears me, if he be but a citizen and a freeman, will be so unfair as not to judge that the question is not of punishment for me, but of reward."¹² Some months later he was on his way into exile. The latent anti-Ciceronian sentiment had triumphed.

¹ A condensation of a paper read before the First Latin Teachers Institute, St. Louis University, July 11, 1940. Some points have been treated in the *TAPA LXV* (1934) 271-281.

² Sallust *Cat.* 48-9.

³ *ad Fam.* V.2,7; Plutarch *Cic.* 23.1.

⁴ *ad Fam.* V.1; V.2.

⁵ *Cat.* 31.6.

⁶ *ad Att.* II.13.

⁷ I.12,29.

⁸ Dio XXXVII.43,1-4; Plut. *Cato Minor* 26-29; Suet. *Caesar* 16.

⁹ *Pro Sulla* 2.6.

¹⁰ Suet. *Caesar* 17.

¹¹ Vell. Pat. 2.45.

¹² *Pro Flacco* 38,97 (Tr. by Strachan-Davidson).

II

k,
al
rd
at
nd
ty

at
e-
ne
me
ce
lid
on
gh
ch
te
en
ed
on

he
—
he
nd
ds
ict
ry
on
but
he
he
he
re-
of
for
ian
ad:
qua

end
ers.
ust
cus
ges
cus
his
nad
ally
be
not
me,
his
ent

atin
ome
..
23.1.
1,1,3.

r 16.
2,45.